



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/047,524      | 10/23/2001  | Hiroto Uchiyama      | 10830-076001        | 3974             |

26211 7590 01/19/2005  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
CITIGROUP CENTER 52ND FLOOR  
153 EAST 53RD STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-4611

EXAMINER

MANOSKEY, JOSEPH D

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2113

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

10/047,524

Applicant(s)

UCHIYAMA, HIROTO

Examin r

Jos ph Manoskey

Art Unit

2113

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohashi, U.S. Patent 5,398,252.

3. Referring to claim 1, Ohashi teaches a LSI tester with a display, this interpreted as an alarm display unit of an IC tester for displaying an alarm when an abnormality occurs in a measured IC (See Fig. 5 and Col. 3, lines 55-58). Ohashi also teaches executed test result that is compared with an expected result and is then introduced back into the test period control and test pattern control which creates new signals to apply to the device under test, this is interpreted as a sampling control portion for collecting data in advance for use in deciding a permissible value for issuing an alarm display and a permissible value calculation portion for calculating the permissible value on the basis of the data collected by the sampling control portion (See Col. 4, lines 22-29). Ohashi discloses the test results being indicated on the display after the output and patterns are compared, this is interpreted as an alarm control portion for judging

Art Unit: 2113

whether an abnormality has occurred and whether the alarm is to be displayed or not, on the basis of the permissible value calculated by the permissible value calculation portion and a measured value obtained from the measured IC (See Col. 5, lines 39-42).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohashi in view of Motoi et al. U.S. Patent 6,480,016, hereinafter referred to as "Motoi".

6. Referring to claim 2, Ohashi teaches all the limitations (See rejection of claim 1) however Ohashi is silent on the use of memory for storing the sampling data, permissible value, and measure value obtained from the IC. Motoi discloses an integrated circuit tester having memory to store the data involved with the testing of the IC (See Fig. 1 and Col. 1, lines 57-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the memory of the IC tester of Motoi with IC tester of Ohashi to store the sampling data, permissible value, and measure value. This would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention to do because memory can store the values during the testing of the IC for comparison after the test (See Motoi, Col. 2, lines 6-15).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 3 and 4 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments, see page 4 of amendment, filed November 4, 2004, with respect to claim 1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 112(2) rejection of claim 1 has been withdrawn.

9. Applicant's arguments, see pages 4 and 5 of amendment, filed November 4, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of new found prior art for claims 1 and 2, see above rejection.

***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following is example of a closely related alarm display system for a tester.


U.S. Patent 5,319,353, to Ohnishi et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Manoskey whose telephone number is (571) 272-3648. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. (7:30am to 4pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDM  
January 12, 2005

  
ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100